

Magnetofluid Unification in the Yang-Mills Lagrangian

A. Fajarudin^{a,b}, A. Sulaiman^{a,c,d*}, T.P. Djun^{a†} and L.T. Handoko^{a,b‡}

^{a)}Group for Theoretical and Computational Physics, Research Center for Physics,
Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Kompleks Puspiptek Serpong, Tangerang 15310,
Indonesia

^{b)}Department of Physics, University of Indonesia, Kampus UI Depok, Depok 16424,
Indonesia

^{c)}P3 TISDA BPPT, BPPT Bld. II (19th floor), Jl. M.H. Thamrin 8, Jakarta 10340,
Indonesia

^{d)}Department of Physics, Bandung Institute of Technology, Jl. Ganesha 10, Bandung
40132, Indonesia

Abstract

The Yang-Mills magnetofluid unification is constructed using lagrangian approach by imposing certain gauge symmetry to the matter inside the fluid. The model provides a general description for relativistic fluid interacting with Abelian or non-Abelian gauge field. The differences with the hybrid magnetofluid model are discussed, and few physical consequences of this formalism are worked out.

PACS : 12.38.Mh, 11.15.-q, 47.75.+f

Some experimental discoveries and studies suggest that the deconfined quark gluon matter is behaving more like a quark gluon plasma (QGP) liquid [1, 2, 3]. This fact motivates tremendous works in constructing the non-Abelian fluid models like magnetohydrodynamics [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].

In some recent models [9, 10, 11], the relativistic hot fluid was described in terms of hybrid magnetofluid field which unifies the electromagnetic and fluid fields. The unification is represented by the effective field strength tensor, $M_{\mu\nu} \equiv F_{\mu\nu} + m/qS_{\mu\nu}$ combining appropriately weighted electromagnetic and fluid fields. The model has

*Email : lyman@tisda.org, sulaiman@teori.fisika.lipi.go.id

†Email : tpdjun@teori.fisika.lipi.go.id

‡Email : handoko@teori.fisika.lipi.go.id, laksana.tri.handoko@lipi.go.id

further been generalized to the non-Abelian case [10]. Also its topological structures has been investigated in detail to model the glueballs [11].

In this Letter, we follow the same line but with different starting point using lagrangian approach and imposing certain gauge symmetry on it. This approach is intended to improve the Yang-Mills magnetofluid unification model [10] in two aspects :

- From field theory point of view, the fluid and another gauge fields should physically be different fields, and then should have independent kinetic terms in the lagrangian. Deploying the above effective field tensor would lead to the unphysical two point interaction connecting two different fields from the gauge invariance kinetic term $M_{\mu\nu}M^{\mu\nu}$ in the lagrangian.
- The hybrid strength tensor $M_{\mu\nu}$ suggests that the fluid and another Abelian or non-Abelian gauge fields are gauge invariance under a single gauge transformation and both should belong to the same Lie group. This requirement is actually necessary since the formalism relies on the Lorentz force equation. This also avoids us to deal with, for instance, the case of non-Abelian fluid interacting with an (Abelian) electromagnetic field.

In order to overcome such problems, we propose local and independent gauge symmetries for each field of fluid and another gauge boson interacting with it, inspired by the unified theory known in particle physics. The model is able to deal with some scenarios like : (i) non-Abelian fluid interacting with non-Abelian gauge field under $G(n)_F \otimes G(n)_G$ symmetry; (ii) non-Abelian fluid interacting with an (Abelian) electromagnetic field under $G(n)_F \otimes U(1)_G$ symmetry; and (iii) Abelian fluid interacting with an electromagnetic field under $U(1)_F \otimes U(1)_G$ symmetry, *i.e.* the original magnetofluid model. Here F and G denote the fluid and another gauge fields respectively. Note that $G(n)$ could be any n dimensional Lie group like $SU(n)$.

Following the basic procedure in lagrangian approach, we start from the following matter lagrangians,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} = \begin{cases} (\partial_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (\partial^\mu \Phi) + \frac{1}{2} m_\Phi^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + V(\Phi) & \text{for boson} \\ i \bar{\Psi} \not{\partial} \Psi - m_\Psi \bar{\Psi} \Psi & \text{for fermion} \end{cases} . \quad (1)$$

$V(\Phi)$ is the potential, for example in a typical Φ^4 theory, $V(\Phi) = \frac{1}{4} \lambda (\Phi^* \Phi)^2$, and $\not{\partial} \equiv \gamma_\mu \partial^\mu$ with γ_μ 's are the Dirac matrices.

Under a local non-Abelian $G(n)$ gauge transformation $U \equiv \exp[-iT_a \theta^a(x)] \approx 1 - iT_a \theta^a(x)$ with $\theta^a \ll 1$, the matter field is transformed as $\Phi \xrightarrow{U} \Phi' \equiv \exp[-iT_a \theta^a(x)] \Phi$ or $\Psi \xrightarrow{U} \Psi' \equiv \exp[-iT_a \theta^a(x)] \Psi$ with the matter field is in general an $n \times 1$ multiplet containing n elements for n dimension Lie groups as $SU(n)$, $O(n+1)$, etc. T^a 's are generators belong to those Lie groups and satisfy certain commutation relation $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$ with f^{abc} is the anti-symmetric structure constant. Anyway, the number of generators, and also gauge bosons, is determined by the dimension of group under consideration. For an $SU(n)$ group one has $n^2 - 1$ generators and the index a runs over $1, 2, \dots, n^2 - 1$. The $U(1)$ is realized by a phase transformation,

$T_a \theta^a(x) \rightarrow \theta(x)$. The gauge invariance is then revealed by introducing gauge field A_μ 's which are transformed as $A_\mu^a \xrightarrow{U} A_\mu^{a'} \equiv A_\mu^a + (1/g)(\partial_\mu \theta^a) + f^{abc} \theta^b A_\mu^c$, and replacing the derivative with the covariant one, $\mathcal{D}_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - ig T^a A_\mu^a$, where g is the gauge “charge”. Further the gauge invariance kinetic term for gauge boson A_μ^a takes the form of $F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu}$, with strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu}^a \equiv \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g f^{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c$.

Now, let us consider the most general case of non-Abelian fluid interacting with any non-Abelian gauge fields represented by $G(n)_F \otimes G(n)_G$ symmetry. Hence we can deploy the above gauge principle for each field independently, that is the gauge transformations are performed separately with independent phase parameters $\theta(x)$'s. Imposing the symmetries, and assigning U_μ and A_μ as the gauge bosons associated with fluid and another gauge fields belong to different group spaces, the covariant derivative becomes,

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + ig_F T_F^a U_\mu^a + ig_G T_G^a A_\mu^a, \quad (2)$$

where g_F is the “charge” for fluid, while g_G is the gauge charge.

Finally the total lagrangian with such gauge symmetries becomes,

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{int.}}, \quad (3)$$

where,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{4} S_{\mu\nu}^a S^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu}, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int.}} = -g_F J_F^a U^{a\mu} - g_G J_G^a A^{a\mu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}^{\text{boson}}, \quad (5)$$

and $S_{\mu\nu}^a \equiv \partial_\mu U_\nu^a - \partial_\nu U_\mu^a + g_F f^{abc} U_\mu^b U_\nu^c$. Meanwhile, in the case of bosonic matter there are additional interference terms in Eq. (5) coming from the gauge invariance kinetic term $(\mathcal{D}_\mu \Phi^\dagger)(\mathcal{D}^\mu \Phi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}^{\text{boson}} &= g_F^2 (\Phi^\dagger T_F^a T_F^b \Phi) U_\mu^a U^{b\mu} + g_G^2 (\Phi^\dagger T_G^a T_G^b \Phi) A_\mu^a A^{b\mu} \\ &\quad + g_F g_G [\Phi^\dagger (T_F^a T_G^b + T_G^b T_F^a) \Phi] U_\mu^a A^{b\mu}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The 4-vector “current” J_μ^a is,

$$J_{X\mu}^a = \begin{cases} -i [(\partial_\mu \Phi)^\dagger T_X^a \Phi - \Phi^\dagger T_X^a (\partial_\mu \Phi)] & \text{for boson} \\ \bar{\Psi} T_X^a \gamma_\mu \Psi & \text{for fermion} \end{cases}, \quad (7)$$

with $X : F, G$ and $\bar{\Psi} \equiv \Psi^\dagger \gamma_0$.

Having the total lagrangian at hand, we can investigate further the dynamics of fluid and the contribution of its interactions with another gauge fields. First of all, let us derive the equation of motion (EOM) of fluid that is our main interest in this Letter. It can be obtained from the lagrangian under consideration through the Euler-Lagrange equation in term of U_μ^a ,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial U_\nu^a} - \partial_\mu \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu U_\nu^a)} = 0, \quad (8)$$

Substituting Eq. (3) into Eq. (8) yields the EOM,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^\nu S_{\mu\nu} &= g_F \mathcal{J}_{F\mu} \quad \text{for Abelian ,} \\ \mathcal{D}^\nu S_{\mu\nu}^a &= g_F \mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a \quad \text{for non - Abelian ,}\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

with the covariant current is,

$$\mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a \equiv \begin{cases} -i [(\mathcal{D}_\mu \Phi)^\dagger T_F^a \Phi - \Phi^\dagger T_F^a (\mathcal{D}_\mu \Phi)] & \text{for boson} \\ J_{F\mu}^a & \text{for fermion} \end{cases} . \tag{10}$$

Moreover, the antisymmetric strength tensor in Eq. (9) implies that $\partial^\mu \mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a = 0$, that is $\mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a$ is a conserved current.

Following the previous works in [9, 10, 11], we can take fluid field to have a relativistic form as follow,

$$U_\mu^a = (U_0^a, \mathbf{U}^a) \equiv u_\mu^a \phi \quad \text{with} \quad u_\mu \equiv \gamma^a (1, -\mathbf{v}^a) , \tag{11}$$

where u_μ is relativistic velocity and the relativistic factor $\gamma \equiv (1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2)^{-1/2}$, while $\mathbf{v}$ is the spatial velocity. On the other hand ϕ is a dimension one auxiliary field to keep correct dimension and should represent the fluid distribution in the system. We should remark that the index a in $\gamma^a \mathbf{v}^a$ is only to label each flow field and not summing up all of them. Therefore, in the present model the fluid is described in terms of its kinematics and distribution function separately. It captures a complicated dynamics modeled as a fluid (like) system. In the case of non-Abelian fluid, we consider several flow fields labeled by the index a . We should remark that, u_μ in Eq. (11) differs slightly with the conventional notation. The reason of taking negative sign in the spatial component of u_μ will be clarified soon. However, more importantly the form still keeps Lorentz invariance.

Now we are ready to investigate in detail the EOM for general non-Abelian case in Eq. (9). For the sake of simplicity and concerning our current interest, Eq. (9) is rewritten in terms of double derivative, covariant current and the rest denoted by ‘‘total force’’ $F_\mu^a = (F_0^a, \mathbf{F}^a) = F_\mu^a(U, A)$. Hence summing up all components we simply have,

$$\partial^0 (\partial_\mu U_0^a - \partial_0 U_\mu^a) - \partial^i (\partial_\mu U_i^a - \partial_i U_\mu^a) = g_F (\mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a + F_\mu^a) , \tag{12}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}F_\mu^a &\equiv f_F^{abc} [\partial^0 (U_\mu^b U_0^c) - \partial^i (U_\mu^b U_i^c)] \\ &\quad - i \left(T_F^d U^{d0} + \frac{g_G}{g_F} T_G^d A^{d0} \right) (\partial_\mu U_0^a - \partial_0 U_\mu^a + g_F f_F^{abc} U_\mu^b U_0^c) \\ &\quad + i \left(T_F^d U^{di} + \frac{g_G}{g_F} T_G^d A^{di} \right) (\partial_\mu U_i^a - \partial_i U_\mu^a + g_F f_F^{abc} U_\mu^b U_i^c) ,\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

using $T^a T^b = 2i f^{abc} T^c$ in the case of $SU(n)$ that is our interest in further discussion. Greek (Latin) indices run over 0, 1, 2, 3 (1, 2, 3). Integrating out both sides in Eq. (12) over t (x_i) for $\mu = i$ ($\mu = 0$), and writing $\mathcal{J}_\mu \equiv (\mathcal{J}_0, \mathbf{J})$, we then have,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{U}^a - \nabla U_0^a = -g_F \oint dt (\mathbf{J}_F^a + \mathbf{F}^a) = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\mathcal{J}_{F0}^a + F_0^a) , \tag{14}$$

which is satisfying the condition for irrotational fluid, *i.e.* the “vorticity” ω ,

$$\omega^a \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{U}^a = 0. \quad (15)$$

This condition is obtained as a non-trivial solution ($\mathbf{U}^a \neq 0$) from the terms $\partial^i (\partial_j U_i^a - \partial_i U_j^a) = [\nabla (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}^a) - \nabla^2 \mathbf{U}^a]_j = [\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{U}^a)]_j$ in Eq. (12), and $\partial_j U_i^a - \partial_i U_j^a = \epsilon_{jik} (\nabla \times \mathbf{U}^a)^k$ in Eq. (13) for $\mu = j \neq i$, while it is vanishing for $\mu = i$. Combining Eqs. (11) and (14),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\gamma^a \mathbf{v}^a \phi) + \nabla (\gamma^a \phi) = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\mathcal{J}_{F0}^a + F_0^a). \quad (16)$$

At non-relativistic limit, $\gamma \sim 1 + 1/2|\mathbf{v}|^2$ and $\phi \sim 1$ for a constant ϕ . These then yield,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}^a}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla |\mathbf{v}^a|^2 = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\mathcal{J}_{F0}^a + F_0^a) \Big|_{\text{non-rel.}}, \quad (17)$$

up to $O(|\mathbf{v}|^2)$ accuracy. Just to mention, one may also take a non-constant ϕ , for instance the hot fluid which takes $\phi_{\text{non-rel.}}(T) \sim 1 + (5/2)(m/T)$ using large T/m expansion [9], inducing some additional terms in both sides of Eq. (17). Further, utilizing the vector identity $\frac{1}{2} \nabla |\mathbf{v}|^2 = (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{v})$, finally we reach at,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}^a}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{v}^a \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}^a = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\mathcal{J}_{F0}^a + F_0^a) \Big|_{\text{non-rel.}}. \quad (18)$$

Obviously, Eq. (18) reproduces the classical EOM for irrotational fluid. We argue that Eq. (16) should be a general relativistic fluid equation. On the other hand, the “current force” $\mathcal{J}_\mu^a$ is induced by the existing matters surrounded by and interacting with the fluid, while F_μ^a is induced by the fluid self-interaction and the interacting gauge fields (A_μ^a). Therefore, the lagrangian in Eq. (3) with the fluid field U_μ^a having a form of Eq. (11) should describe a general relativistic fluid system interacting with another gauge fields and matters inside. Actually, the relative signs in the first and second terms in the left hand side of Eqs. (16), (17) and (18) relies on the sign of $\mathbf{U}$ component in Eq. (11). This is the reason we should take the notation in Eq. (11) rather than the conventional one for relativistic velocity.

To be more specific, let us consider a magnetofluid unification involving a non-Abelian SU(3) fluid contains particles of quarks and anti-quarks interacting with an electromagnetic field, *i.e.* the lagrangian with SU(3)_F $\otimes$ U(1)_G gauge symmetry,

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{Q}\not{\partial}Q - m_Q\bar{Q}Q - \frac{1}{4}S_{\mu\nu}^a S^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + g_F J_{F\mu}^a U^{a\mu} + q J_{G\mu} A^\mu. \quad (19)$$

from Eqs. (1), (4) and (5). Here g_G is replaced with q denoting the quark charge, Q represents the quark (color) triplet, $J_F^{a\mu} = \bar{Q}T_F^a\gamma^\mu Q$ and $J_G^\mu = \bar{Q}\gamma^\mu Q$, while T_F^a 's belongs to the SU(3) Gell-Mann matrices. The model describes “macroscopically” non-Abelian fluid formed by dense gluon cloud surrounding the matters (quarks and anti-quarks) in an electromagnetic field. This fits the experimental clue from PHENIX Collaboration at the BNL-RHIC [2], far from being the weakly interacting

collisionless plasma the deconfined quark gluon matter behaves more like a quark gluon fluid. This description is, however completely different with the hybrid magnetofluid model [9, 10] where the fluid flows denote the quarks and anti-quarks interacting with the gluon fields.

From Eq. (7) the zero-th component of fermion current, *i.e.* the current density, is $\mathcal{J}_{F0}^a = J_{F0}^a = Q^\dagger T_F^a Q \equiv \rho_F^a$. Using Eq. (16) its relativistic dynamics obeys,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\gamma^a \mathbf{v}^a \phi) + \nabla (\gamma^a \phi) = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\rho_F^a + F_0^a) . \quad (20)$$

Meanwhile g_F should be associated with the fine structure constant of strong interaction $g_F^2 = 4\pi \alpha_s$ with α_s depends on the energy scale of physics under consideration [13]. According to the experimental results [3], the hot QGP is dense but seems to flow with tiny viscosity approximating the ideal fluid. This draws $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}^a \sim 0$ affecting the term $f_F^{abc} \partial^i (U_0^b U_i^c)$ in Eq. (13), and $\omega^a \sim 0$ satisfying Eq. (15). Moreover, as seen in the above lagrangian the gluon fluid itself does not feel the electromagnetic force, but the quarks and anti-quarks do. In contrary, the electromagnetic force still contributes to the EOM in Eq. (20), but it is suppressed by a factor of $q/g_F \propto \sqrt{\alpha/\alpha_s} \sim O(10^{-1})$ since the quark charge is proportional to the electric charge $e = \sqrt{\alpha/4\pi}$. Therefore the electromagnetic force contributes about few percents, and might be neglected for a good accuracy.

For completeness, we can derive the total energy due to fluid and electromagnetic fields in the above case. The lagrangian density for the fluid and electromagnetic fields is,

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} S_{\mu\nu}^a S^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + g_F J_{F\mu}^a U^{a\mu} + q J_{G\mu} A^\mu \quad (21)$$

We can define $E_{Fi}^a \equiv -S_{0i}^a$ and $\epsilon_{jik} B_F^{ak} \equiv S_{ji}^a$ with $i \neq j$ denoting the electric- and magnetic-like fields of fluid analogous to the usual electric and magnetic fields $E_i = -F_{0i}$ and $\epsilon_{jik} B^k = F_{ji}$. Then, $S_{\mu\nu}^a S^{a\mu\nu} = -2(|\mathbf{E}_F^a|^2 - |\mathbf{B}_F^a|^2)$ in analogy to $F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} = -2(|\mathbf{E}|^2 - |\mathbf{B}|^2)$. Due to the condition in Eq. (15), $\mathbf{B}_F^a = \frac{1}{2} g_F f^{abc} \mathbf{U}^b \times \mathbf{U}^c$, while $\mathbf{E}_F^a = -g_F \oint d\mathbf{x} (\rho_F^a + F_0^a)$ from the EOM in Eq. (9). Hence, omitting the small electromagnetic current term we can easily deduce the Hamiltonian density,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} = & \frac{1}{2} g_F^2 \left(\left| \oint d\mathbf{x} (\rho_F^a + F_0^a) \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |f^{abc} \mathbf{U}^b \times \mathbf{U}^c|^2 \right) + g_F \gamma^a \phi (\rho_F^a + \mathbf{v}^a \cdot \mathbf{J}_F^a) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (|\mathbf{E}|^2 + |\mathbf{B}|^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

In the simplest case of pure gluon fluid, only the first and second terms will remain,

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} g_F^2 \left(\left| \oint d\mathbf{x} F_0^a \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |f^{abc} \mathbf{U}^b \times \mathbf{U}^c|^2 \right) , \quad (23)$$

since $\mathcal{J}_{F\mu}^a = 0$ in the absence of matter. Taking its non-relativistic limit, the total energy is simply $H = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_{\text{non-rel.}}$. For example having particular temperature dependent ϕ would actually enable us to calculate any physical observables (free energy, entropy, etc) through the partition function density $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Tr} [\exp(\mathcal{H}/T)]$.

We have studied the magnetofluid unification using lagrangian approach and imposing the gauge principle in Abelian and non-Abelian cases. The model provides new insights into macroscopic dynamics of relativistic hot fluids relevant for QGP. An example of $SU(3)_F \otimes U(1)_G$ model, in particular, may describe some of the puzzles posed by the data from the RHIC indicating that there is a very rapid thermalization in the collisions, after which a fluid with very low viscosity and large transport coefficients seems to be produced, and surprisingly the produced medium seems to be strongly interacting [2]. Recently, the ALICE experiment at the LHC is also challenging to resolve this puzzle [14]. It is also argued that the formalism leads to different physical consequences than the other ones derived from the hybrid magnetofluid model. However, all consequences here arise naturally from first principle without any fine tuning. The results should lead to some interesting phenomenon either in QGP or fluid based cosmology. Such studies, including simulations based on numerical computation for particular cases, are in progress.

We greatly appreciate fruitful discussion with N. Riveli, H.B. Hartanto and A. Oxalio throughout the work. This work is partially funded by the Indonesia Ministry of Research and Technology and the Riset Kompetitif LIPI in fiscal year 2007 under Contract no. 11.04/SK/KPPI/II/2007.

References

- [1] C. Adler *et.al.* (STAR Collaboration), *Phys. Rev.* **C66**, 034904 (2002).
- [2] K. Adevox *et.al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), *Nucl. Phys.* **A757**, 184 (2005).
- [3] For a recent review see : E. Shuryak, *Nucl.Phys.* **A774**, 387 (2006).
- [4] U. Heinz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 351 (1983).
- [5] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *J. Math. Phys.* **33**, 1782 (1992).
- [6] D.D. Holm and B.A. Kupershmidt, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 2557 (1984).
- [7] J.P. Blaizot and E. Iancu, *Nucl. Phys.* **B421**, 565 (1994).
- [8] B. Bistrovic, R. Jackiw, H. Li, V.P. Nair and S.Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev.* **D67**, 025013 (2003).
- [9] S.M. Mahajan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 035001 (2003).
- [10] B.A. Bambah, S.M. Mahajan and C. Mukku, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 072301 (2006).
- [11] B.A. Bambah, S.M. Mahajan and C. Mukku, **arXiv:0705.3881**, (2007).
- [12] C. Manuel and S. Mrowczynski, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 105003 (2006).
- [13] Particle Data Group, *Nucl. Phys.* **G33**, 1 (2006).
- [14] B Alessandro *et.al.* (ALICE Collaboration), *J. Phys.* **G32**, 1295 (2006).